



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,633	07/17/2007	Karl-Hermann Schmidt	4111.04WOUS	3185
24113	7590	06/29/2011	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON THUENTE CHRISTENSEN PEDERSEN, P.A. 4800 IDS CENTER 80 SOUTH 8TH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100			CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/29/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,633	SCHMIDT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PRABHA CHUNDURU	1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2011.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19,21-23 and 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19,21-23 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)	
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/18/11</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Applicants' response to the office action field on April 14, 2011 has been considered and acknowledged.
2. The Information Disclosure field on April 18, 2011 has been considered.

Status of the Application

3. Claims 1-19, 21-23, 26-29 are pending under examination. Claims 20, 24-25 are cancelled.

All arguments and amendment have been fully considered and deemed persuasive for the reasons that follow. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The action is made FINAL necessitated by the IDS.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- A. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-19, 21, 22-23, 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Akira et al. (CA 02385302 A1).

Akira et al. teach a method of claim 1, 3, 22-23, 27, of separating and enriching prokaryotic DNA comprising

- (a) contacting a solution comprising at least one prokaryotic DNA having unmethylated sequence, with a protein which binds to unmethylated sequences of said prokaryotic DNA

having 25 % homology with CPGB protein thereby forming a protein-DNA complex (see abstract, page 27, claim 23, page 10, paragraph 2-3, page 18, paragraph 1-2);

(b) separating and isolating said complex, cloning and expressing said DNA (see page 27, claim 23, page 10, paragraph 2-3, page 11, paragraph 1, page 18, paragraph 1-2, page 19, line 1-17).

With regard to claim 4, Akira et al. teach that the separation is followed by separation of DNA from the protein of the complex ((see page 10, paragraph 2-3, page 11, paragraph 1, page 18, paragraph 1-2, page 19, line 1-17).

With regard to claim 5-7, 10-12, 14, Akira et al. teach that the protein is bound directly to a carrier and the carrier is a matrix bound via an antibody (see (see page 27, claim 23, page 10, paragraph 2-3, page 11, paragraph 1, page 18, paragraph 1-2, page 19, line 1-17).

With regard to claim 13, Akira et al. teach that the separation is effected by means of electrophoresis (see page 11, paragraph 1).

With regard to claim 15-16, Akira et al. teach that the solution contains a mixture of prokaryotic and eukaryotic DNA and the prokaryotic DNA is bacterial DNA (see abstract, page 27, claim 23, page 10, paragraph 2-3, page 18, paragraph 1-2).

With regard to claim 17, 26, Akira et al. teach that the solution is derived from body fluid comprises cell preparation from blood, saliva, urine (see page 18, paragraph 1).

With regard to claim 18-19, Akira et al. teach that the separation is achieved by means of a filter matrix (column) upon which the protein is immobilized (see page 11, paragraph 1).

With regard to claim 21, Akira et al. teach that the DNA is amplified (see page 18, paragraph 1).

With regard to claim 28-29, Akira et al. teach diagnosis of cancer having specific methylation pattern (see page 15, paragraph 1). Accordingly the claims are anticipated.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-19, 21-23, 26-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No.10/528,235 (hereafter ‘235). Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

they are not patentably distinct from each other because an obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim not is patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed.Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claim 1, 23, 25-27 are generic to all that is recited in claims 1-2, 15-16 of the co-pending application ‘235. That is, claims 1, 23, 25-27 are anticipated by the claims 1-2, 15-16 of the co-pending application ‘235. Specifically the method of enriching prokaryotic DNA by contacting said DNA with a polypeptide or protein that specifically binds to said protein and separating or isolating, enriching the complex of protein-DNA, are within the scope of the patented claims. Further the instant claims 2-19, 21-23, 28-29 are within the scope of the claims 3-14 of the co-pending application ‘235. Thus the instant claims encompass the claims in the co-pending application and are related as genus and species, and are coextensive in scope.

The courts have stated that a genus is obvious in view of the teachings of a species. see Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); and In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1989). Therefore the instantly claimed method is obvious over the claims in the co-pending application ‘235.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to arguments:

6. With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-19, 21-23, 26-29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Cross et al. in view of Wiemann et al., the Applicants' arguments were fully considered and found persuasive in view of arguments.

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 4/18/11 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suryaprabha Chunduru whose telephone number is 571-272-0783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30A.M. - 4.30P.M, Mon - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Suryaprabha Chunduru/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637